

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-13, 15 and 21-30 are pending herein. Claims 1, 26 and 30 have been amended hereby, and claims 2, 14 and 16-20 have been cancelled hereby without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

1. Examiner Hinze is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's undersigned representative during a telephonic interview on March 6, 2006, the substance of which is incorporated below.
2. Claims 1-5, 13-20, 23 and 26 were rejected under §103(a) over Adams in view of Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 26 have each been rewritten to incorporate features such as those previously recited in dependent claims 2 and 18, for example. Accordingly, rewritten claims 1 and 26 now recite that the main body portions of the clock kit of claim 1 and the clock of claim 26 are limited to being made of a substantially flexible material that is selected from among textiles, papers, cardboards, metal fabrics, natural fiber woven materials and ceramic woven fibers. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that none of these specific, substantially flexible materials are disclosed or suggested in any of the applied references.

That is, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in the applied references that a main body portion of a clock kit or clock is, should, or even could be made of any of the specific substantially flexible materials now recited in independent claims 1 and 26. While Adams teaches that the door element is generally made of wood or plastic, as Examiner Hinze correctly noted on page 5 of the Office Action in connection with his discussion of claim 18, Applicant respectfully submits that these materials are no longer included among the group of *substantially flexible* materials that is now recited in independent claims 1 and 26. During the

telephonic interview, Examiner Hinze tentatively agreed that the applied references do not disclose or suggest the materials now recited in the independent claims.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art could not possibly have been motivated to provide a clock kit or clock having an interchangeable main body portion made of the otherwise undisclosed substantially flexible materials recited in claims 1 and 26 in view of the applied references.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending herein define patentable subject matter over the applied references and respectfully requests that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3. Claims 6, 7, 22, 24 and 25 were rejected under §103(a) over Adams in view of Smith and further in view of Huffman. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 6, 22, 24 and 25 each depend indirectly from independent claim 1, which is discussed above in Section 2. Since independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over the applied references at least for the reasons explained above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 7, 22, 24 and 25 likewise define patentable subject matter over the applied references at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

4. Claim 8 was rejected under §103(a) over Adams in view of Smith and further in view of Shanok. Claims 9-12 were rejected under §103(a) over Adams in view of Shanok and further in view of Prevost. Claim 28 was rejected under §103(a) over Adams in view of Shanok and further in view of Lehmann, and claim 29 was similarly rejected over Adams in view of Shanok and Prevost and further in view of Lehmann. Claim 30 was rejected under §103(a) over Adams in view of Shanok, Prevost and Lehmann. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

That is, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 8-12 and 21, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, are moot for the

same reasons explained above in Section 3. Similarly, the rejections of claims 27-29 are likewise moot for at least similar reasons, since these dependent claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 26 (which defines patentable subject matter over the applied references at least in the same manner as independent claim 1 as explained above in Section 2).

Independent claim 30 recites a clock that includes, among other things, the features recited in independent claim 26. In particular, independent claim 30 also recites that the interchangeable main body portion comprises a substantially flexible material that is selected from the group consisting of textiles, papers, cardboards, metal fabrics, natural fiber woven materials, and ceramic woven fibers.

Since independent claim 30 recites an interchangeable main body portion having the same distinct features as those discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 26, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 30 likewise defines patentable subject matter over the applied references for at least the same reasons explained above with respect to independent claims 1 and 26.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending herein define patentable subject matter over the applied references and respectfully requests that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If Examiner Hinze believes that contact with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, he is herein requested to call Applicant's attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

March 7, 2006
Date



Stephen P. Burr
Reg. No. 32,970

Nicole J. Buckner
Reg. No. 51,508

SPB/NB/gmh

BURR & BROWN
P.O. Box 7068
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191
Telephone: (315) 233-8300
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320